arXiv:1610.06716v1 [hep-th] 21 Oct 2016

Noncommutative Spaces and Poincaré Symmetry

Stjepan Meljanac[a], **Daniel Meljanac**[a], **Flavio Mercati**[b] and **Danijel Pikutić**[a]

[a]Division of Theoretical Physics, Rudjer Bošković Institute, Bijenička c. 54, HR-10002 Zagreb, Croatia
[b]Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, 31 Caroline St. N.,
Waterloo, ON, N2L 2Y5 Canada

Abstract

We present a framework which unifies a large class of non-commutative spacetimes that can be described in terms of a deformed Heisenberg algebra. The commutation relations between spacetime coordinates are up to linear order in the coordinates, with structure constants depending on the momenta plus terms depending only on the momenta. The possible implementations of the action of Poincaré transformations on these deformed phase spaces are considered, together with the consistency requirements they introduce. It is found that Lorentz transformations in general act nontrivially on tensor products of momenta. In particular, a 'backreaction' effect needs to be considered, which changes in a momentum-dependent way the Lorentz group element which acts on the left and on the right of a composition of two momenta. We conclude with two representative examples, which illustrate the 'backreaction' effect.

1. Introduction

The framework of Quantum Field Theory[1] (QFT) has been extremely successful in predicting new phenomena and reaching great accuracy in the description of known phenomena. This framework, however, is based on a fixed kinematic structure given by the background spacetime on which the matter fields propagate. In the most successful applications of QFT this background is assumed to be Minkowski space $\mathcal{M}_{1,3}$. Such a structure is untenable if we want our description of physics to be valid up to energies of the order of the Planck scale $E_p \sim 10^{28} eV$. At these energies gravitational effects become important, and a naive effective description involving quantum fluctuations of the gravitational field around a Minkowski background turns out not to be renormalizable [1], signalling that the theory needs an unknown ultraviolet completion.

A possible insight towards progress comes from 2+1 dimensional Quantum Gravity, which is a topological theory without local, propagating degrees of freedom. If this theory is coupled to a scalar field, and the topological degrees of freedom of the metric are integrated away, one ends up with an effective theory for the scalar field on a background which is not Minkowski space [2, 3]. The background geometry is noncommutative, in the sense that the algebra of functions over this background is not abelian.[2]

This opens up the possibility that the sought-after UV completion of Quantum Gravity might not be found by simply changing the field content or the symmetries within the traditional scheme of QFT on a classical background. It may be necessary to generalize QFT to *Noncommutative* QFT (NCQFT), in which the kinematical structure is not simply given by a spacetime background, but it is encoded in some nontrivial commutation relations.

It becomes then necessary to understand the types of noncommutative spaces that are the candidates to play the role of background for NCQFT, the kinematic structures they encode, and their symmetries. Usually a noncommutative spacetime is defined by specifying the commutation relations for a coordinate basis, $\hat{x}_\mu$, $\mu = 0, ..., 3$. The three

[1]Or rather Effective Field Theory.

[2]For the meaning of noncommutative spacetimes, read [4].

most popular types of commutation relations considered in the literature are (i) Lie-algebra type [5], (ii) Moyal type [6, 7] and (iii) Snyder type [8]:

$$\begin{array}{lll} (i) & [\hat{x}_\mu, \hat{x}_\nu] = i\hat{x}_\alpha C_{\mu\nu}{}^\alpha, & C_{\mu\nu}{}^\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \\ (ii) & [\hat{x}_\mu, \hat{x}_\nu] = i\Theta_{\mu\nu}, & \Theta_{\mu\nu} \in \mathbb{R} \\ (iii) & [\hat{x}_\mu, \hat{x}_\nu] = isM_{\mu\nu}, & s \in \mathbb{R} \end{array} \tag{1}$$

where $M_{\mu\nu}$ is the generator of Lorentz transformations.

In this paper we introduce a framework which includes all the cases of eq. (1) as sub-cases, and is capable of describing much more general cases. This framework is based on the idea that any noncommutative algebra can be obtained as a particular nonlinear realization of the Heisenberg algebra.

2. Deformed phase space

We start with the Heisenberg algebra $\mathcal{H}$, which is a unital algebra generated by the eight generators x_μ, p_ν, $\mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3$. The commutation relations are $[x_\mu, x_\nu] = 0$, $[p_\mu, p_\nu] = 0$, $[p_\mu, x_\nu] = -i\eta_{\mu\nu}$, where $\eta = \mathrm{diag}(-1, 1, 1, 1)$.

A nonlinear change of basis allows us to define a set of generically noncommutative coordinates:

$$\hat{x}_\mu = x_\alpha \varphi^\alpha{}_\mu \left(\tfrac{p}{M}\right) + \tfrac{1}{M}\chi_\mu \left(\tfrac{p}{M}\right), \tag{2}$$

where M is a constant with the dimensions of a mass which parametrizes the magnitude of spacetime noncommutativity (and is expected to be of the order of the Planck mass). Assuming that at large distances (or low energies) the effects of noncommutativity become irrelevant, and the generators (2) coincide with x_μ, we can impose the 'boundary conditions' $\varphi^\alpha{}_\mu(0) = \delta^\alpha{}_\mu$ and $\chi_\mu(0) = 0$. If we assume $\varphi^\alpha{}_\mu$ to be an invertible matrix, the inverse relations to (2) exist: $x_\mu = (\hat{x}_\alpha - \chi_\alpha)(\varphi^{-1})^\alpha{}_\mu$.

Changing base from x_μ to $\hat{x}_\mu$ leads to the deformed Heisenberg algebra $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$:

$$\begin{array}{c} [\hat{x}_\mu, \hat{x}_\nu] = \frac{i}{M}\hat{x}_\alpha C_{\mu\nu}{}^\alpha \left(\frac{p}{M}\right) + \frac{i}{M^2}\Theta_{\mu\nu}\left(\frac{p}{M}\right), \\ [p_\mu, \hat{x}_\nu] = -i\varphi_{\mu\nu}\left(\frac{p}{M}\right), \quad [p_\mu, p_\nu] = 0, \end{array} \tag{3}$$

where $C_{\mu\nu}{}^\alpha = (\varphi^{-1})^\alpha{}_\beta \left(\varphi^\gamma{}_\mu \partial_\gamma \varphi^\beta{}_\nu - \varphi^\gamma{}_\nu \partial_\gamma \varphi^\beta{}_\mu\right)$ and $\Theta_{\mu\nu} = -\chi_\alpha (\varphi^{-1})^\alpha{}_\beta \left(\varphi^\gamma{}_\mu \partial_\gamma \varphi^\beta{}_\nu - \varphi^\gamma{}_\nu \partial_\gamma \varphi^\beta{}_\mu\right) - \varphi^\gamma{}_\mu \partial_\gamma \chi_\nu + \varphi^\gamma{}_\nu \partial_\gamma \chi_\mu$, where $\partial_\gamma = M\frac{\partial}{\partial p^\gamma}$. The generalized Jacobi relations are satisfied by construction. The commutators (3) of $\hat{x}_\mu$ unifiy into a single formalism the three kinds of noncommutative spaces which have been considered in the literature, listed in eq. (1).

From now on we will work in units in which $M = 1$.

We can define the subalgebra $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{H}$ of commutative coordinates as $\mathcal{A} = \mathrm{span}(x_\mu)$. We can define a left-action of $\triangleright : \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$ with the following axioms [9]:

$$\begin{array}{l} f(x) \triangleright g(x) = f(x)g(x), \\ p_\mu \triangleright f(x) = [p_\mu, f(x)] \triangleright 1, \\ p_\mu \triangleright 1 = 0, \end{array} \tag{4}$$

for all $f(x), g(x) \in \mathcal{A}$. This left-action corresponds to an action by multiplication of coordinates: $x_\mu \triangleright f(x) = x_\mu f(x)$, and an action of momenta by left-derivative: $p_\mu \triangleright f(x) = -i\frac{\partial f}{\partial x^\mu}$. The action $\triangleright$ is an left algebra homomorphism, which means that it respects the product of $\mathcal{H}$ so that $(ab) \triangleright f = a \triangleright (b \triangleright f)$. So any product of p_μ's and x_μ's in a particular order will act on f by applying derivatives and left-multiplications in the corresponding order.

It can be proven explicitly [9, 10, 11] that

$$e^{ik\cdot\hat{x}} \triangleright 1 = e^{iK(k)\cdot x + ig(k)}, \tag{5}$$

where $k \in \mathcal{M}_{1,3}$ and $K : \mathcal{M}_{1,3} \to \mathcal{M}_{1,3}$ is an invertible map $K_\mu(K^{-1}(k)) = k_\mu$ and $g : \mathcal{M}_{1,3} \to \mathbb{R}$.

For any function $f(x) \in \mathcal{A}$ that can be Fourier-transformed $f = \int d^4k \tilde{f}(k) e^{ik\cdot x}$ we can define, using relation (5), an element $\hat{f} \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\hat{f} \triangleright 1 = f(x)$. This allows us to introduce a noncommutative star-product $\star : \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$:

$$f(x) \star g(x) = \left(\hat{f}\hat{g}\right) \triangleright 1 = \hat{f} \triangleright g(x). \tag{6}$$

The $\star$-product beween exponentials is [12]

$$e^{ik\cdot x} \star e^{iq\cdot x} = e^{iK^{-1}(k)\cdot\hat{x}} \triangleright e^{iq\cdot x}. \tag{7}$$

This is used to determine the composition law of momenta, which is physically relevant as it determines how particle momenta are conserved in vertices.

3. Deformed composition of momenta

With an explicit calculation, one can prove the following relation (see [10, 11])

$$e^{ik\cdot\hat{x}} \triangleright e^{iq\cdot x} = e^{i\mathcal{P}(k,q)\cdot x + iQ(k,q)}, \tag{8}$$

where, from Eq. (5), we see that $K_\mu(k) = \mathcal{P}_\mu(k,0)$ and $g(k) = Q(k,0)$. Using the homomorphism property of $\triangleright$ we can deduce the following relation:

$$e^{-i\lambda k\cdot\hat{x}} p_\mu e^{i\lambda k\cdot\hat{x}} \triangleright e^{iq\cdot x} = \mathcal{P}_\mu(\lambda k, q) e^{iq\cdot x}. \quad (9)$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Differentiating such a relation with respect to λ leads to

$$\frac{d\mathcal{P}_\mu(\lambda k, q)}{d\lambda} = \varphi_\mu{}^\alpha \left(\mathcal{P}(\lambda k, q)\right) k_\alpha, \quad (10)$$

notice that $\mathcal{P}_\mu$ only depends on $\varphi_\mu{}^\alpha$. We can determine Q by differentiating wrt λ the following modification of relation (9):

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{-i\lambda k\cdot(x_\alpha \varphi^\alpha{}_\mu(p))} p_\mu e^{i\lambda k\cdot\hat{x}} \triangleright e^{iq\cdot x} \\ &\quad = \mathcal{P}_\mu(\lambda k, q) e^{iq\cdot x + iQ(\lambda k, q)}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

and using (10), one gets

$$\frac{dQ(\lambda k, q)}{d\lambda} = k_\alpha \chi^\alpha \left(P(\lambda k, q)\right). \quad (12)$$

We can see how Q does depend on χ_μ, and it is zero if $\chi_\mu = 0$.

The differential equations (10) and (12) determine P_μ and Q, if supplemented with the boundary conditions $\mathcal{P}_\mu(k,0) = K_\mu(k)$, $\mathcal{P}_\mu(0,q) = q_\mu$, $Q(k,0) = g(k)$, $Q(0,q) = 0$, $K_\mu(0) = 0$, $g(0) = 0$. Using Eq. (5) and (8), we conclude that the star-product between two plane waves is

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{ik\cdot x} \star e^{iq\cdot x} = e^{iK^{-1}(k)\cdot\hat{x} - ig\left(K^{-1}(k)\right)} \triangleright e^{iq\cdot x} \\ &= e^{i\mathcal{P}\left(K^{-1}(k),q\right)\cdot x + iQ\left(K^{-1}(k),q\right) - iQ\left(K^{-1}(k),0\right)}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The generalized addition rule for plane wave momenta is then

$$(k \oplus q)_\mu = \mathcal{D}_\mu(k,q) = \mathcal{P}_\mu\left(K^{-1}(k), q\right), \quad (14)$$

where $\mathcal{D}_\mu(k,0) = k_\mu$ and $\mathcal{D}_\mu(0,q) = q_\mu$.

4. Coproduct, twist and star product

Let us introduce the coproduct of momenta [9]

$$\Delta p_\mu = \mathcal{D}_\mu\left(p \otimes 1, 1 \otimes p\right), \quad (15)$$

and the twist element [13, 14]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^{-1} &=: e^{i(1\otimes x^\mu)(\Delta - \Delta_0)p_\mu + iG(p\otimes 1, 1\otimes p)} : \\ &=: e^{i(1\otimes x^\mu)(\Delta-\Delta_0)p_\mu} : e^{iG(p\otimes 1, 1\otimes p)}, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $\Delta_0 p_\mu = p_\mu \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes p_\mu$ is the undeformed coproduct, $G(k,q) = Q(K^{-1}(k), q) - Q(K^{-1}(k), 0)$, and $: _ :$ denotes a normal ordering prescription in which the coordinates x_μ stand at the left of the momenta p_μ. The twist $\mathcal{F}^{-1}$ is determined up to the right ideal $\mathcal{I}_0$ defined by [14, 15]

$$m\left(\mathcal{I}_0(\triangleright \otimes \triangleright)(f \otimes g)\right) = 0 \quad \forall f, g \in \mathcal{A} \quad (17)$$

where $m : \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ is the multiplication map of the algebra $\mathcal{H}$.

The star-product is then defined as

$$(f \star g)(x) = m\left[\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\triangleright \otimes \triangleright)(f \otimes g)\right]. \quad (18)$$

Note that if $[\hat{x}_\mu, \hat{x}_\nu] = 0$, equation (3), then the star product is commutative and associative but generally non-local. If $C_{\mu\nu}{}^\alpha\left(\frac{p}{M}\right)$ or $\Theta_{\mu\nu}\left(\frac{p}{M}\right)$ depend on momenta, then the star product is non-associative.

The following identities hold:

$$\hat{x}_\mu = m\left[\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\triangleright \otimes 1)(x_\mu \otimes 1)\right], \quad (19)$$

and

$$\hat{f} = m\left[\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\triangleright \otimes 1)(f \otimes 1)\right], \ \hat{f} \triangleright 1 = f, \quad (20)$$

where $f \in \mathcal{A}$. Then consistency requirements impose

$$\Delta p_\mu = \mathcal{F}(\Delta_0 p_\mu)\mathcal{F}^{-1} = \mathcal{D}_\mu(p \otimes 1, 1 \otimes p), \quad (21)$$

in accordance to Eq. (15).

The undeformed phase space generated by x_μ, p_μ has the structure of a Hopf algebroid [14, 16], while the appropriate structure of the deformed phase space generated by $\hat{x}_\mu$, p_μ is that of a twisted Hopf algebroid, defined by the twist element $\mathcal{F}$ in equation (16) [14, 15, 17] This is a generalization of the structures of Hopf algebras. [18].

5. Poincaré symmetry

The deformed phase space structures introduced above are not necessarily Lorentz-invariant in a naive way. The introduction of the energy scale M into the structure of space time/phase space is incompatible with standard Lorentz symmetry, but, as is well-known after a few decades of studies of noncommutative spacetimes, this does not imply that the relativistic equivalence between inertial frames is lost. In many cases, a 'deformed' action of the Lorentz group allows to restore relativistic invariance [19, 20]. A common assumption

in this framework is that the Lorentz group itself is not deformed (this is justified by the fact that a dimensionful parameter like M^{-1} cannot enter the algebraic structure of the Lorentz group). What is deformed is the action of the group on noncommutative coordinates $\hat{x}_\mu$ and momenta p_μ, and on composed momenta (see below). Typically, there are several possible realizations of the action of the Lorentz group on our deformed phase space [21], and we want to 'parametrize our ignorance' by writing the most generic one and then constraining its free parameters. To this end, we employ the trick of introducing a nonlinear realization of Heisenberg's algebra by performing a momentum-dependent similarity transformation on $\mathcal{H}$:

$$P_\mu = \Sigma_\mu(p), \quad X_\mu = x_\alpha \Psi^\alpha{}_\mu(p) + h_\mu(p), \tag{22}$$

if the functions $\Sigma_\mu(p)$ and $\Psi^\alpha{}_\mu(p)$ are constrained by

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial \Sigma_\mu}{\partial p_\alpha} \Psi^\alpha{}_\nu = \eta_{\mu\nu}, \\ &\Psi_{\gamma\mu} \frac{\partial \Psi^\beta{}_\nu}{\partial p_\gamma} - \Psi_{\gamma\nu} \frac{\partial \Psi^\beta{}_\mu}{\partial p_\gamma} = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

in order that the basis (P_μ, X_ν) generates an undeformed Heisenberg algebra, $[P_\mu, P_\nu] = [X_\mu, X_\nu] = 0$, $[P_\mu, X_\nu] = -i\eta_{\mu\nu}$.

Because the new basis satisfies undeformed commutation relations, we can introduce a generator of infinitesimal Lorentz transformations as

$$M_{\mu\nu} = X_\mu P_\nu - X_\nu P_\mu, \tag{24}$$

and we will be ensured that the commutation relations between $M_{\mu\nu}$ and itself will close an $so(3,1)$ algebra, and their action on X_μ and P_μ will be undeformed. However, the action of $M_{\mu\nu}$ on $\hat{x}_\mu$ and p_μ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} &[M_{\mu\nu}, p_\rho] = p_\alpha \Phi^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu\rho}(p), \\ &[M_{\mu\nu}, \hat{x}_\rho] = i\left(\hat{x}_\alpha \Gamma^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu\rho}(p) + \Xi_{\mu\nu\rho}(p)\right), \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where $\Phi^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu\rho}(p)$, $\Gamma^\alpha{}_{\mu\nu\rho}(p)$ and $\Xi_{\mu\nu\rho}$ can be expressed in terms of $\Sigma_\mu(p)$, $\Psi^\alpha{}_\mu$, $h_\mu(p)$, $\varphi^\alpha{}_\mu(p)$ and $\chi_\mu(p)$.

The Casimir operator is of course $\mathcal{C} = P_\mu P^\mu = \Sigma^2(p)$. The coproduct of the Lorentz generator is

$$\Delta M_{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{F}\left(\Delta_0 M_{\mu\nu}\right) \mathcal{F}^{-1}, \tag{26}$$

where $\Delta_0 M_{\mu\nu} = M_{\mu\nu}(\Delta_0 x, \Delta_0 p)$, which is not necessarily a primitive coproduct (because $M_{\mu\nu}$ depends in a complicated way on x_μ and p_μ).

If we use the inverse relations of (22) and express the generators $\hat{x}_\mu$ in terms of X_μ, Σ_ν, we call $\hat{x}_\mu(X, P)$ the 'natural realization'.

6. Finite Lorentz transformations and backreaction

A finite Lorentz transformation simply acts classically on the generators P_μ: $P_\mu \to \lambda_\mu{}^\nu P_\nu$, *e.g.*

$$\begin{cases} P_0' = P_0 \cosh\xi + P_1 \sinh\xi \\ P_1' = P_0 \sinh\xi + P_1 \cosh\xi \end{cases}, \tag{27}$$

for a boost of rapidity ξ in the direction 1. Then we know what the action on p_μ is:

$$p'_\alpha = \Sigma^{-1}_\alpha \left(\lambda_\mu{}^\nu \Sigma_\nu(p)\right). \tag{28}$$

The relation above can be found explicitly, at first order in M^{-1} and all orders in the rapidity parameter, see [22]. So given $\lambda_\mu{}^\nu \in SO(3,1)$ we define

$$\Lambda(\lambda_\mu{}^\nu, p) = \Sigma^{-1}\left(\lambda_\mu{}^\nu \Sigma_\nu(p)\right), \tag{29}$$

as the corresponding Lorentz transformation of p.

In general, such a transformation rule will not leave the genearalized addition law of momenta invariant:

$$\Lambda(\lambda, k \oplus q) \neq \Lambda(\lambda, k) \oplus \Lambda(\lambda, q). \tag{30}$$

As observed first in [23], this is physically inconsistent, but can be fixed by observing that Eq. (30) is implicitly assuming that the three momenta k, q and $k \oplus q$ all transform with the same Lorentz group element λ. In [24, 23] the particular case of κ-Poincaré, a vector-like deformation such as that studied in the second example below, was studied. The findings of [23] were that there is a 'backreaction' effect of momenta on Lorentz transformations, which changes the Lorentz-group elements λ that act on the left and on the right in the rhs of eq. (30) in a way that depends on the momenta k and q involved in the vertex:

$$\Lambda(\lambda, k \oplus q) \neq \Lambda(\lambda^{(1)}(k,q), k) \oplus \Lambda(\lambda^{(2)}(k,q), q). \tag{31}$$

The equations above impose a series of constraints on the functions $\lambda^{(1)}{}_\mu{}^\nu(k,q)$, $\lambda^{(2)}{}_\mu{}^\nu(k,q)$, $\mathcal{D}_\mu(k,q)$ and $\Lambda_\mu(\lambda, q)$. In [20] these constraints were calculated in a perturbative setting (at first order in M^{-1} and assuming undeformed rotational simmetry). The constraints found were enough to completely fix $\lambda^{(1)}{}_\mu{}^\nu(k,q)$ and $\lambda^{(2)}{}_\mu{}^\nu(k,q)$, and to establish a few relationships between the parameters of $\mathcal{D}_\mu(k,q)$ and $\Lambda_\mu(\lambda, q)$.[3]

[3] Alternatively, these constraints could be interpreted as

7. Examples

For Snyder-type spaces [25, 26]

$$\hat{x}_\mu = x_\mu \varphi_1(p^2) + (x\cdot p)p_\mu \varphi_2(p^2) + p_\mu \chi(p^2), \quad (32)$$

the relativistic addition of momenta is covariant under Lorentz transformations and $\xi_1 = \xi_2 = \xi$.

For general u_μ vector-like deformations of Minkowski space at first order in M^{-1}, the realization is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{x}_\mu &= x_\mu + c_1 x_\mu (u\cdot p) + c_2 u_\mu (x\cdot p) + \\ &c_3 u_\mu (u\cdot x)(u\cdot p) + c_4 (u\cdot x)p_\mu + \mathcal{O}(M^{-2}).\end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where $u^2 \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$.

The commutator of coordinates is of the form

$$[\hat{x}_\mu, \hat{x}_\nu] = i(a_\mu \hat{x}_\nu - a_\nu \hat{x}_\mu) + \mathcal{O}(M^{-2}) \quad (34)$$

where $a_\mu = (c_1 - c_2)u_\mu$.

The basis X_μ, P_μ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}X_\mu = x_\mu &- d_1 x_\mu (u\cdot p) - d_1 u_\mu (x\cdot p) \\ &- 2d_3 u_\mu (u\cdot x)(u\cdot p) - 2d_4 (u\cdot x)p_\mu \\ &+ \mathcal{O}(M^{-2})\end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

$$\begin{aligned}P_\mu = p_\mu &+ d_1 (u\cdot p)p_\mu + d_2 u_\mu p^2 \\ &+ d_3 (u\cdot p)^2 u_\mu + \mathcal{O}(M^{-2})\end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

In 1+1 dimensions, the backreaction factors are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_1(q) &= \xi[1 - (c_2 + d_1)u\cdot q], \\ \xi_2(k) &= \xi[1 - (c_1 + d_1)u\cdot k].\end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

In the κ-Poincaré case, the d's are given in terms of the c's by

$$d_1 = -c_2, \; d_2 = -\frac{c_1 - c_2 + c_4}{2}, \; d_3 = -\frac{c_3}{2}. \quad (38)$$

The backreaction factors then simplify to

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_1(q) &= \xi, \\ \xi_2(k) &= \xi(1 - a\cdot k).\end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

An exact result (at all orders in M^{-1} and ξ) in Majid-Ruegg basis is given in [24].

fixing completely the parameters of $\Lambda_\mu(\lambda, q)$ as functions of the parameters of $\mathcal{D}_\mu(k, q)$, ${\lambda^{(1)}}_\mu{}^\nu(k, q)$ and ${\lambda^{(2)}}_\mu{}^\nu(k, q)$.

8. Outlook and discussion

By using general nonlinear redefinitions of the basis of the Heisenberg algebra (with the only assumption of being up-to-linear order in the coordinates x_μ), we were able to encompass within a unified framework a large class of noncommutative spacetimes. Within this framework, we have a prescription to uniquely determine the effect of combining two plane waves, which gives a composition rule for momenta that deforms the momentum conservation laws of special relativity into a nonlinear operation. Moreover, in our framework, we have unique prescriptions that characterize the momenta and determine the Hopf algebroid structure. These algebraic structures have been recognized to be the suitable framework to describe the symmetries of noncommutative spacetimes. Finally, we studied how to introduce Lorentz symmetry in our framework: this cannot be done uniquely, as it introduces a certain degree of arbitrariness (in a perturbative approach this amounts to a few free parameters). However, this arbitrariness is constrained by the requirement of relativistic invariance of the momentum composition law. The recently-discovered phenomenon of 'backreaction' of momenta on Lorentz transformations [23] (*i.e.* the rapidity with which momenta participating to a vertex transform depends on the momenta) was found to constrain the form of the acceptable Lorentz transformations. To show the applicability of the framework we presented, we concluded this Letter with two examples: one is a class of noncommutative spacetimes which generalizes that introduced by Snyder in 1947 [8]. This example leads to no backreaction effect and no deformation of the Lorentz group action. The second one is a generalization of the so-called κ-Minkowski spacetime, which is the first one for which the backreaction effect was discovered. The phenomenon of momentum backreaction could have interesting phenomenological consequences. For example, in astrophysical settings one can have high-energy particles emitted from high-redshift sources. This is a situation in which both the momenta involved in a process and the rapidity identifying the reference frame are appreciably large (in Planck units), and the backreaction effect might become manifest.

Acknowledgements

The work by S.M. and D.P. has been fully supported by Croatian Science Foundation under the

Project No. IP-2014-09-9582. F.M. was supported by Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics. Research at Perimeter Institute is supported by the Government of Canada through Industry Canada and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Research and Innovation.

References

[1] R. P. Feynman, F. B. Morinigo, W. G. Wagner, Feynman lectures on gravitation (2003).

[2] H.-J. Matschull, M. Welling, Quantum mechanics of a point particle in (2+1)-dimensional gravity, Class. Quant. Grav. 15 (1998) 2981–3030. arXiv:gr-qc/9708054, doi:10.1088/0264-9381/15/10/008.

[3] L. Freidel, E. R. Livine, Effective 3-D quantum gravity and non-commutative quantum field theory, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96 (2006) 221301. arXiv:hep-th/0512113, doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.221301.

[4] S. Majid, Algebraic approach to quantum gravity ii: noncommutative spacetime, Approaches to quantum gravity (2009) 466. arXiv:hep-th/0604130.

[5] J. Lukierski, A. Nowicki, H. Ruegg, New quantum Poincaré algebra and κ-deformed field theory, Physics Letters B 293 (3) (1992) 344–352. doi:10.1016/0370-2693(92)90894-A.

[6] H. J. Groenewold, On the principles of elementary quantum mechanics, Physica 12 (7) (1946) 405–460.

[7] J. E. Moyal, Quantum mechanics as a statistical theory, in: Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society, Vol. 45, Cambridge Univ Press, 1949, pp. 99–124.

[8] H. S. Snyder, Quantized space-time, Physical Review 71 (1) (1947) 38.

[9] T. Juric, S. Meljanac, D. Pikutic, Realizations of κ-Minkowski space, Drinfeld twists and related symmetry algebras, Eur. Phys. J. C75 (11) (2015) 528. arXiv:1506.04955, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3760-7.

[10] D. Kovačević, S. Meljanac, A. Samsarov, Z. Škoda, Hermitian realizations of κ-Minkowski space–time, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A30 (03) (2015) 1550019. arXiv:1307.5772, doi:10.1142/S0217751X15500190.

[11] S. Meljanac, Z. Škoda, D. Svrtan, Exponential formulas and Lie algebra type star products, SIGMA 8 (2012) 013. arXiv:1006.0478, doi:10.3842/SIGMA.2012.013.

[12] D. Kovačević, S. Meljanac, Kappa-Minkowski spacetime, Kappa-Poincaré Hopf algebra and realizations, J. Phys. A 45 (2012) 135208. arXiv:1110.0944, doi:10.1088/1751-8113/45/13/135208.

[13] T. R. Govindarajan, K. S. Gupta, E. Harikumar, S. Meljanac, D. Meljanac, Twisted Statistics in kappa-Minkowski Spacetime, Phys. Rev. D 77 (2008) 105010. arXiv:0802.1576, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.77.105010.

[14] T. Juric, S. Meljanac, R. Strajn, Twists, realizations and Hopf algebroid structure of kappa-deformed phase space, International Journal of Modern Physics A 29 (2014) 1450022. arXiv:1305.3088, doi:10.1142/S0217751X14500225.

[15] T. Jurić, D. Kovačević, S. Meljanac, κ-Deformed Phase Space, Hopf Algebroid and Twisting, SIGMA 10 (2014) 106, 18 pages. arXiv:1402.0397, doi:10.3842/SIGMA.2014.106.

[16] J.-H. Lu, Hopf algebroids and quantum groupoids. arXiv:q-alg/9505024.

[17] T. Juric, S. Meljanac, R. Strajn, κ-Poincare-Hopf algebra and Hopf algebroid structure of phase space from twist, Physics Letters A 377 (2013) pp. 2472–2476. arXiv:1303.0994, doi:10.1016/j.physleta.2013.07.021.

[18] J. Lukierski, Z. Skoda, M. Woronowicz, Deformed Covariant Quantum Phase Spaces as Hopf Algebroids, Physics Letters B 750 (2015) 401–406. arXiv:1507.02612, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2015.09.042.

[19] G. Amelino-Camelia, Fate of Lorentz symmetry in relative-locality momentum spaces, Physical Review D 85 (8) (2012) 084034. arXiv:1110.5081, doi:PhysRevD.85.084034.

[20] J. Carmona, J. Cortes, F. Mercati, Relativistic kinematics beyond special relativity, Physical Review D 86 (8) (2012) 084032. arXiv:1206.5961, doi:PhysRevD.86.084032.

[21] D. Kovacevic, S. Meljanac, A. Pachol, R. Strajn, Generalized Poincare algebras, Hopf algebras and kappa-Minkowski spacetime, Physics Letters B 711 (2012) 122–127. arXiv:1202.3305, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2012.03.062.

[22] N. Loret, Exploring special relative locality with de Sitter momentum-space, Phys. Rev. D90 (12) (2014) 124013. arXiv:1404.5093, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.124013.

[23] G. Gubitosi, F. Mercati, Relative locality in κ-Poincaré, Classical and Quantum Gravity 30 (14) (2013) 145002. doi:10.1088/0264-9381/30/14/145002.

[24] S. Majid, H. Ruegg, Bicrossproduct structure of κ-Poincare group and non-commutative geometry, Phys. Lett. B 334 (1994) 348–354. arXiv:hep-th/9405107, doi:10.1016/0370-2693(94)90699-8.

[25] M. V. Battisti, S. Meljanac, Scalar Field Theory on Non-commutative Snyder Space-Time, Phys. Rev. D 82 (2010) 024028. arXiv:1003.2108, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.82.024028.

[26] S. Meljanac, D. Meljanac, S. Mignemi, R. Strajn, Snyder-type spaces, twisted Poincaré algebra and addition of momenta. arXiv:1608.06207.